

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections set forth in the Office Action of January 25, 20006 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner objected to the drawings as not showing every feature of the invention as recited in the claims. In particular, the Examiner asserted that the rollers which are adjustable with respect to height as recited in original claim 3 were not shown in any of the original drawings. However, the Examiner is requested to note that the original claims have been cancelled and replaced with new claims 10-18, and none of the new claims recite the feature that the rollers are adjustable with respect to height. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's objection to the drawings is no longer applicable.

The Examiner objected to the specification because there appeared to be an inconsistency with respect to the identification of the carrier rail and the extension rail. In order to address this objection, and in order to make various additional editorial corrections throughout the specification and abstract, the entire specification and abstract have now been reviewed and revised. As the revisions are quite extensive, the amendments to the specification and abstract have been incorporated into the attached substitute specification and abstract. For the Examiner's benefit, a marked-up copy of the specification indicating the changes made thereto is also enclosed. No new matter has been added by the revisions. Entry of the substitute specification is thus respectfully requested. Furthermore, in view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's objection to the specification has been overcome.

The Examiner rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In particular, the Examiner asserted that it is not clear how the support rollers are mounted so as to be adjustable with respect to height, as recited in original dependent claim 3. However, as noted above with respect to the Examiner's objection to the drawings, the feature recited in the original claims describing that the height of the support rollers is adjustable has been omitted from the new claims. Consequently, it is respectfully

submitted that the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is not applicable to the new claims.

The Examiner also rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the Examiner cited several examples of vague language which renders the scope of the original claims unclear. In view of these formal rejections, and in order to place the original claims in a preferred form according to U.S. practice, the original claims have now been cancelled and replaced with new claims 10-18. All of the new claims have been drafted so as to address the specific examples of vague language cited by the Examiner, and so as to fully comply with all of the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, are not applicable to the new claims.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 4-6 as being anticipated by the Dykstra reference (US 4,482,066); rejected claims 2, 3, and 7 as being unpatentable over the Dykstra reference in view of the Moose reference (US 4,633,615); and rejected claims 8 and 9 as being unpatentable over the Dykstra reference in view of the Moose reference, and further in view of the Kano reference (US 5,090,171). However, as indicated above, all of the original claims have been cancelled and replaced with new claims 10-18, including new independent claims 10 and 18. For the reasons discussed below, it is respectfully submitted that the new claims are clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

Each of new independent claims 10 and 18 describes the features of at least one extension guide fitting for a drawer. In particular, the extension guide fitting (and each of the extension guide fittings of claim 18) includes an extension rail, a carrier rail, and middle rail arranged to run between the extension rail and the carrier rail. Carriages have running rollers mounted therein for transmitting a load between the extension rail, the middle rail, and the carrier rail. A *rocker member* is mounted at a front portion of the carrier rail, and stationary support rollers are mounted in the rocker member. The rocker member and the stationary support rollers are arranged so that the extension rail runs on the stationary support rollers and is supported by the stationary support rollers at least when the extension rail is in a closed position.

In general, extension guide fittings are under considerable stress, particular when the associated drawer is heavy. As a result, the running rollers in the extension guide fitting are often deformed, which significantly worsens the performance of the extension guide fitting. The rocker member with the stationary support rollers mounted in the rocker member as set forth in the new claims addresses this problem.

In particular, because the rocker member with the stationary support rollers is mounted at a front portion of the carrier rail, the stationary support rollers will help support the weight of the drawer, particular when the drawer is in the closed position. Therefore, deformation of the running rollers of the extension guide fitting can be eliminated or significantly minimized. Moreover, the rocker member allows the extension guide fitting to compensate for manufacturing tolerances so that the drawer can be smoothly opened and closed even if there is a slight misalignment or misadjustment of the extension guide fitting.

The Dykstra reference is directed to a storage rack with an extendable shelf structure, and the Kano reference is directed to a movable partitioning panel. However, neither of these references discloses or suggests a rocker member as recited in new independent claims 10 and 18.

The Moose reference teaches an interlocking roller wheel assembly for a sliding patio door, and the Examiner asserted that the Moose reference teaches a rocker mount 16a, 16b. However, the Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of the Moose reference.

As is well known in the art, a "rocker member" is a member that is capable of rocking or tilting. For example, a "rocker arm" is a lever which can "rock" or pivot about an axis. In this regard, *Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary* defines the term "rocker" as "any of various devices that work *with a rocking motion*" (emphasis added). A close examination of the Moose reference clearly shows that the two wheeled roller assembly 10 of the Moose reference does not constitute a rocker member that operates with a rocking motion. In particular, as illustrated in Figures 4 and 5 of the Moose reference, the roller assembly 10 includes roller wheels 14a, 14b arranged between carriage plates 16a, 16b, and each of the carriage plates 16a, 16b has a

projecting leg portion 18a, 18b which projects downward (see column 2, lines 15-28). A hook portion 19a, 19b is located at the bottom of each of the projecting leg portions 18a, 18b for engaging opposite square shoulders at the underside of a rounded post head 40 of a track 12 on which the roller assembly 10 rides (see column 3, lines 24-34). Due to the engagement of the hook portions 19a, 19b with the post head 40 of the track 12, it is clear that the roller assembly 10 is incapable of rocking or pivoting. Consequently, it is submitted that the roller assembly 10 of the Moose reference does not constitute a rocker member as suggested by the Examiner.

As explained above, the Dykstra reference, the Moose reference and the Kano reference do not disclose or suggest a rocker member mounted at a front portion of a carrier rail as recited in new independent claims 10 and 18. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify or combine the references so as to obtain the invention recited in the new claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that new claims 10-18 are clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner should have any comments or suggestions to help speed the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative.

Respectfully submitted,

Helmut FITZ

By: 

W. Douglas Hahm
Registration No. 44,142
Attorney for Applicant

WDH/ck
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
April 25, 2006